



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/798,056	03/11/2004	Junzo Tokunaka	450100-04964	4967

7590 10/16/2008
William S. Frommer, Esq.
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
745 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10151

EXAMINER

TAKLE, MESEKER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2175

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/16/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/798,056

Applicant(s)

TOKUNAKA, JUNZO

Examiner

MESEKER TAKELE

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed 07/18/2008.
2. Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8 and 12 are independent claims. In the instant Amendment, claims 1, 8 and 12 were amended. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 1, 3-4, 7-8, 10-12, 14-15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuller et al. ("Fuller" US Patent No.: 6,833,865) in view of Harper et al. ("Harper", US Patent No.: 6,476,817).

As to claim 1, Fuller discloses An information processing apparatus for handling a storage medium storing content data and metadata associated therewith (col., 2 lines, 52-67), , comprising:

an extracting section for extracting, from said metadata stored on said storage medium (abstract, col., 2 lines, 52-67 and claim 32), and for generating a metadata extraction window (col., 3 lines, 45-67),

wherein the extraction section performs automatic extraction in accordance with a preset extraction condition (col., 2 lines, 52-67) and manual extraction in accordance with a selective instruction made by a user (col., 4 lines, 1-20 and Figure 4 (element 401)); and

wherein the information display unit displays user-selectable metadata in the metadata extraction window (col., 4 lines, 30-45 and claim 20).

However Fuller does not explicitly disclose (a) said storage medium being provided with on a surface thereof an information display area (b) display data to be displayed in said information display area (c) an information display unit for displaying the extracted display data and the metadata extraction window onto said information display area.

Harper, from the same field of endeavor discloses (a) said storage medium being provided with on a surface thereof an information display area (col., 2 line 62-64 and Figure 4) (b) display data to be displayed in said information display area (col., 2 line 62-64 and Figure 4) (c) an information display unit for displaying the extracted display data and the metadata extraction window onto said information display area (col., 2 line 62-64 and Figure 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Fuller's teaching with the teaching of Harper, because Harper's device eliminates the need of the display driver within the storage medium.

As to claim 3, Harper discloses wherein said information display area is exchangeable with another information display area. Yamaguchi from the same field of endeavor disclose wherein said information display area is exchangeable with another information display area (Figures 1 and 4).

As to claim 4, Harper discloses wherein said information display area is constituted by a rewrite sheet (col., 4 line, 50).

As to claim 7, Harper discloses wherein said content data include at least video content data and said information display unit displays, in said information display area, thumbnail image data extracted from said video content data on the basis of said metadata (col., 5 lines, 30-55).

Claims 8 and 12 are similar in scope to claim 1 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 10 and 14 are similar in scope to claim 3 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 11 and 15 are similar in scope to claim 4 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is similar in scope to claim 7 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

4. Claims 2, 5-6, 9, 13, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuller et al. ("Fuller" US Patent No.: 6,833,865) in view of Harper et al. ("Harper", US Patent No.: 6,476,817) in further in view of Bloch et al. ("Bloch" US Patent No.: 5,754,102).

Art Unit: 2175

As to claim 2, Fuller and Harper do not disclose wherein said information display area is rewritable.

However Bloch from the same field of endeavor discloses wherein said information display area is rewritable (such as, "electric paper" system is that such a display can be re-written upon essentially limitlessly, col., 4 line, 50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Fuller and Harper's teaching with the teaching of Bloch.

The motivation to combine will provide for adding/deleting data to/from the storage media as desired.

As to claim 5, Bloch discloses, wherein said information display unit displays, in said information display area, said display data by coding at least a part thereof (col., 2 lines, 5-7).

As to claim 6, Bloch discloses a metadata editing section for editing said metadata in accordance with a processing result of said content data, wherein said extracting section extracts said display data also from the edited metadata (col., 3 lines, 23 -36).

Claims 9 and 13 are similar in scope to claim 2 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is similar in scope to claim 5 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is similar in scope to claim 6 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to the amended independent. Claims 1, 8 and 12 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that neither Fuller nor Harper teaches or suggests the extraction section performs automatic extraction in accordance with a preset extraction condition and manual extraction in accordance with a selective instruction made by a user.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Fuller in view of Harper teaches the extraction section performs automatic extraction in accordance with a preset extraction condition and manual extraction in accordance with a selective instruction made by a user (col., 4 lines, 1-20 and Figure 4 (element 401)).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

Art Unit: 2175

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiry

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MESEKER TAKELE whose telephone number is (571)270-1653. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30AM-5:00PM est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on (571) 272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Meseker Takele/
Examiner, Art Unit 2175

/WILLIAM L. BASHORE/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175